



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,718	02/12/2001	Hong Yang	21650.06000	7995

22242 7590 03/07/2005

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/781,718	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peng Ke	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 1/4/05.

This action is final.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, and 7 are independent claims.

In the Amendment, filed on 1/4/5, claims 7-10 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent (US 5,528,260) in view of Risberg et al. (US 5,339,392).

As per claim 1, Kent teaches a method for displaying text in a fixed-sized information box on a viewing screen, the method comprising:

determining whether a length of the text message is too long to fit in the information box based on the selected font size (col. 3, lines 52-64, col. 4, lines 47-68);

displaying an amount of the text message that fits in the information box based on the selected font size (col. 3, lines 25-39);

However he fails to teach selecting a desired font size for displaying text messages that are displayed in an information box on a viewing screen; formatting a text message for display in the information box on the viewing screen according to the selected font size;

Risberg teaches selecting a desired font size for displaying text messages that are displayed in an information box on a viewing screen; formatting a text message for display in the information box on the viewing screen according to the selected font size (fig. 20, 'Font').

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Risberg's teaching with Kent's method in order to provide user with the ability to change the display characters.

As per claim 3, Risberg et al. and Kent teach the method of Claim 1. Risberg et al. further teaches wherein a selection of available font sizes is preset (col. 34, 62-68).

As per claim 4, it is rejected with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, it is rejected under same scope as claim 3 (see rejection above)

As per claim 7, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 8, it is of the same scope as claim 2 (supra).

As per claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 3 (supra).

As per claim 10, Risberg et al. and Kent teaches the method of claim 7. Kent further teaches method comprising:

Implementing a scrolling function; and

Altering the scrolling the text message according to the scrolling function (col. 4, lines 48-68)

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent (US 5,528,260) in view of Risberg et al. (US 5,339,392) further in view of Nawaz (6,421,694)

As per claim 2, Kent and Risberg et al. teach the method of Claim 1. However, they fail to teach wherein when a last line of the text message is displayed, the text message continues scrolling from a beginning of the text message.

Nawaz et al. teaches when a last line of the text message is displayed, the text message continues scrolling from a beginning of the text message (col. 8, lines 16-20)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Nawaz et al. teaching with method of Risberg's and Kent's method in order to display data in a continuous and seamless manner.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, it is rejected under same scope as claim 2 (see rejection above).

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/4/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments focused on the following:

A) Neither Kent nor Risberg et al. teaches, "formatting a text message for display in the information box on the viewing screen according to the selected font size."

A) Examiner disagrees. Risberg et al. teaches displaying of real time data in the user defined "...style, e.g., color, **font**, background, **pen size** etc..." (col. 2, lines 30-40) Therefore Risberg teaches formatting a text message for display in the information box on the viewing screen according to the selected font size.

Art Unit: 2174

B) Applicant argued that because Kent teaches a method of scrolling that “is implemented without requiring any changes in the user interface” and therefore Kent teaches away from the option of changing user interface.

B) Examiner disagrees. Kent did not restrict his method to user interfaces that are not changeable. Kent’s method is designed to solve the problem that user’s desired input is larger than the window size and he has listed a number of programs that may have this problem. (col. 1, lines 50-55) The programs that he has listed include paint, draw, and CAD, which are known to give user the option of changing the input text’s size and front. Further, the problem that Kent is intended to solve is precisely the problem that Risberg’s method will encounter when the user enlarge the size of the text in the display window. (col. 2, lines 30-40) The statement cited by the applicant is simply a condition that Kent’s method may be implemented under. Therefore, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Kent’s teaching with the method of Risberg.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2174

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peng Ke', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.